REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 13, 2003 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto. Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application and claims 1, 6-8, 13 and 14 have been amended. No new matter has been added through the above amendments. Claims 1-15 continue to stand rejected. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Burrows* (U.S. Patent No. 5,745,889). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as might be applied against the claims as amended, for the following reasons.

The present invention is directed, according to claim 1, to a method of performing a table look-up in a network device. The method includes receiving a data packet through an input port of the network device, parsing the data packet into an index portion and a corresponding bucket portion, indexing the index portion to the corresponding bucket portion and accessing address table information stored in an address look-up table using the bucket portion.

The present invention is directed, according to claim 8, to an address table look-up indexing device. The device includes a receiver portion of a port of a network device that receives an incoming data packet, a data parser that parses the data packet into an index portion and a corresponding bucket portion, an indexer that indexes the index portion to

the bucket portion and an address lookup device that accesses an address look-up table using the corresponding bucket portion.

The present invention is directed, according to claim 15, to a network switch. The network switch includes multiple ports used for receiving and exporting data, each of the multiple ports being connected to one another through a communications medium and multiple Address Resolution Logic (ARL) devices, each of the multiple ARL devices being connected to one of the multiple ports, with each of the multiple ports having a corresponding ARL device. Each of the multiple ARL devices has a parser that parses data into an index portion and a corresponding bucket portion, an indexer that indexes the index portion to a corresponding bucket portion and a look-up device that accesses table entries in a look-up table using the bucket portion.

In general, the present application is concerned with an improved table lookup indexing system in a network device for handling of data packets. The improved lookup method is important because the less time an address lookup takes, the faster the processing of data packets can occur and the network device performs more quickly than other network devices that do not utilize the improved table lookup indexing system. It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of the preceding claims and also fails to provide the critical advantages discussed above.

Burrows addresses parsing and indexing a database, but in contrast to Applicant's invention, *Burrows* discloses a method for parsing an extremely large database (e.g., the Internet) having content (e.g., web pages) and content attributes (e.g. location). (Col. 1,

ll. 50-52). *Burrows* discloses a parsing module 30 (Fig. 2) which breaks down web pages 200 into fundamental indexable elements including the words found on a web page and the location of these words on the web page. These parsed indexable elements are referred to as "atomic pairs" 400 which consist of a word (410) and its location (420). (Col. 4, ll. 51-57). The word is a literal representation of the parsed portion of the web page content and the location is a numeric value (e.g., assigned integer). (Col . 4, ll. 57-64).

Applicant respectfully submits that *Burrows* fails to teach or suggest the claimed method of performing a table look-up in a network device of claim 1, the claimed address table look-up indexing device of claim 8 or the claimed network switch of claim 15. As discussed in the specification of the instant application, a network switch is utilized in a network environment to receive and handle data packets. *Burrows* fails to teach or suggest a network switch, ports for receiving and exporting data and address resolution logic that is uses processed portions of the packet data to determine a destination address for the data packet. As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that any rejection of claims 1-14, as amended, over *Burrows* would be improper for failing to teach or suggest all of the elements of those claims.

With respect to claim 15, Applicant respectfully points out, again, that the rejection applying *Burrows* does not address the features recited in claim 15 in any manner. While the rejection of claim 15 makes reference to that claim, the Office Action appears to characterize claim 15 as the same as claims 1 and 8, even though claim 15 has

additional elements not recited in the other claims. Additionally, the Office Action's Response to Amendment section also fails to address Applicant's indications that elements of claim 15 are plainly not found in *Burrows*. For this additional reason, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 15 is neither taught nor suggested by *Burrows* and that the rejection should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

With respect to the remaining Office Action points regarding Applicant's dependent claims, Applicant does not separately address each Office Action comment but traverses the rejection of the dependent claims on the basis that they are patentable over *Burrows* for the same reasons previously discussed with respect to independent claims 1, 8 and 15. For all the reason discussed above, Applicant submits that *Burrows* does not anticipate or render obvious, claims 1-15. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested and it is requested that the application be allowed to proceed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, Applicant hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees or deficiency of fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin F. Turner
Registration No. 43,437

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

KFT/noe